

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner specifically stated that the phraseology "it being also possible...enantiomeric form" (page 7, line 4) renders Claim 1 confusing and therefore the claim is indefinite. Per Examiner's suggestion, Applicant has rewritten the alternative steps as separate claims. This accounts for new independent claims 9, 16 and 23 and all new claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 2 has been canceled. Claim 3 has been amended to recite dependency on Claim 1 only.

The Examiner objected to Claim 4 under 37 CFR 1.75 (c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend on another multiple dependent claim, i.e. Claim 3. Applicant has amended the claim to recite dependency on claim 3 only.

The Examiner objected to Claim 5 under 37 CFR 1.75 (c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim must be written in the alternative and cannot depend on a multiple dependent claim, i.e. Claims 3-4. Applicant has amended the claim to recite dependency on Claim 1 only.

The Examiner objected to Claim 6 under 37 CFR 1.75 (c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend on itself. Also, a multiple dependent claim cannot be dependent on another multiple dependent claim, i.e. Claims 3-5. Applicant has amended the claim to recite dependency on Claim 5 only.

The Examiner objected to Claim 7 under 37 CFR 1.75 (c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot be dependent on another multiple dependent claim, i.e. Claims 3-6. Applicant has amended the claim to recite dependency on Claims 1, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Claims 3, 4, 5 and 6, as amended herein, are no longer multiple dependent claims.

The Examiner objected to Claim 8 under 37 CFR 1.75 (c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot be dependent on another multiple dependent claim, i.e. Claims 3-7. Applicant has amended the claim to recite dependency on Claims 1, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Claims 3, 4, 5 and 6, as amended herein, are no longer multiple dependent claims.

Claims 2-8 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The amendment of the base claim (Claim 1) per Examiner's suggestion renders this objection moot.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Barbara E. Kurys, Reg. No. 34,650
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Aventis Pharmaceuticals Inc.
(a member of the sanofi-aventis group)
U.S. Patent Operations
Route #202-206 / P.O. Box 6800
Bridgewater, NJ 08807-0800
Telephone (908) 231-2965
Telefax (908) 231-2626

Aventis Docket No. DEAV2003/0014 US NP